

Hello Mr. Daniel McNally

2 pages
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 11 2006

I received your letter on November 15
2006, as I moved from California to
Oregon. I didn't received your phone call
as the CA phone was disconnected.

I left a message on your voice mail on 11-17-06
I am asking to pay the one month late
response fee of \$60.

Attached is my election.

I left a message on your voice mail on 11-17-06
with my election.

Thanks, Ehud Geva
new address & phone



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,183	04/23/2004	Shmuel Erez		
10/830,183 ⁷⁵⁹⁰	10/02/2006	<u>New address</u>	7716	7716
Ehud Geva 4190 Maybell Way Palo Alto, CA 94306		3555 NW Lehman PL Beaverton, OR 97006 PH: 503-617-7404	EXAMINER MCNALLY, DANIEL	
		ART UNIT 1733	PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

FAX # 503-617-7404

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application/Control Number: 10/830,183
Art Unit: 1733

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

election: ✓ ①. Claims 1-18, drawn to an article, classified in class 257, subclass 706.

II. Claims 19-23, drawn to a process, classified in class 156, subclass 84.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by another process without heat shrinking the insert.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. A telephone call was made to Ehood Geva on September 26, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement be